

Quantum Adiabatic Computation With a Constant Gap is Not Useful in One Dimension

M. B. Hastings¹

¹*Center for Nonlinear Studies and Theoretical Division,
Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545*

We show that it is possible to use a classical computer to efficiently simulate the adiabatic evolution of a quantum system in one dimension with a constant spectral gap, starting the adiabatic evolution from a known initial product state. The proof relies on a recently proven area law for such systems, implying the existence of a good matrix product representation of the ground state, combined with an appropriate algorithm to update the matrix product state as the Hamiltonian is changed. This implies that adiabatic evolution with such Hamiltonians is not useful for universal quantum computation. Therefore, adiabatic algorithms which are useful for universal quantum computation either require a spectral gap tending to zero or need to be implemented in more than one dimension (we leave open the question of the computational power of adiabatic simulation with a constant gap in more than one dimension).

There are many different models for quantum computation. The most standard approach is the gate model, combined with appropriate error correction to deal with decoherence[1]. Other approaches include measurement based quantum computer[2], topological quantum computing[8], and adiabatic quantum computation[3]. Adiabatic quantum computation is very natural because one can imagine slowly changing the Hamiltonian following a path in parameter space, starting from some simple Hamiltonian with a known ground state, and arriving at some final Hamiltonian whose ground state encodes the solution of a difficult optimization problem[4].

While adiabatic quantum computation has been shown to allow for universal quantum computation[5], and hence is equivalent in its computational power, the fault tolerant approach and related threshold theorems[6] have not been generalized to adiabatic quantum computation. Instead, one can rely on the spectral gap in the Hamiltonian to protect against errors. The spectral gap is also interesting in adiabatic quantum computation because the time required to perform the computational scales with the inverse spectral gap. It has at least been shown[7] that one can produce a constant gap against *local* noise on 1 and 2 qubits, but has never been shown that one can produce a constant gap against all excitations.

Therefore, it is of great interest to determine if universal adiabatic quantum computation can be performed in systems with a spectral gap of order *unity*. In a sense, topological quantum computation provides a means of performing universal adiabatic quantum computation with constant gap, by adiabatically changing the Hamiltonian to drag defects around each other. However, this topological approach relies on having a large ground state degeneracy. In this paper we show that, at least in one dimension, adiabatic quantum computation in systems with a unique ground state and a constant spectral gap is not useful for quantum computation as it can be simulated efficiently on a classical computer.

Main Result— We consider the following problem.

Consider a parameter-dependent Hamiltonian $H(s) = \sum_i h_{i,i+1}(s)$, with $h_{i,i+1}(s)$ having support on sites $i, i+1$ and with $\|h_{i,i+1}(s)\| \leq J$, so that interactions are nearest neighbor. Let there be N sites, and assume that each site has a Hilbert space dimension D which is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Assume that for all s with $0 \leq s \leq s_{max}$ we have a spectral gap ΔE with $J/\Delta E$ being $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Finally, assume that $\|\partial_s h_{i,i+1}\| \leq J$; this last requirement simply sets some scale for how large s is. In general, if we have $\|\partial_s h_{i,i+1}\| \leq X$, for any constant $X > J$, we can rescale $s \rightarrow sX/J$ and $s_{max} \rightarrow s_{max}X/J$, and with this rescaled s the requirement $\|\partial_s h_{i,i+1}\| \leq J$ becomes satisfied. Assume that $H(0)$ has a known product ground state. Consider any observable O which is a product of operators supported on a single site.

Our main result is that it is possible to compute the expectation value of O in the ground state of $H(s_{max})$ to any desired accuracy ϵ_0 by an algorithm that takes a computational time T given by

$$T = \exp[\mathcal{O}(D^{\mathcal{O}(\omega)})] \mathcal{O}(N(J/\Delta E)s_{max}(N/\epsilon_0)^\omega), \quad (1)$$

on a *classical* computer, where the exponent ω equals

$$\omega = \mathcal{O}(\ln(D)J/\Delta E). \quad (2)$$

For any operator P supported on a constant number of sites, n , we can write P as a sum over D^{2n} different product operators O . Therefore, the ability to approximate product operators implies the ability to approximate general operators on a constant number of sites. This result implies that physical quantities such as the ground state energy of $H(s_{max})$ can be approximated to within accuracy $1/\text{poly}(N)$ in polynomial time on a classical computer.

We rely heavily on the area law for one-dimensional systems with gapped Hamiltonians[9] proven recently. Let $\psi^0(s)$ denote the ground state of $H(s)$. Given that $H(s)$ satisfies the conditions above including $J/\Delta E$ being $\mathcal{O}(1)$, the area law implies that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can

approximate $\psi^0(s)$ by a matrix product state $\psi_{mps}(s)$ such that

$$|\psi^{mps}(s) - \psi_s^0|^2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (3)$$

and such that $\psi_{mps}(s)$ has bond dimension

$$k = \mathcal{O}(N/\epsilon)^\omega \exp[\mathcal{O}(D^{\mathcal{O}(\omega)})]. \quad (4)$$

The bond dimension is polynomial in N/ϵ , but may be doubly exponentially large in $J/\Delta E$; this general upper bound applies to all one-dimensional systems while specific cases in practice have not required such a large bond dimension. While the area law implies the existence of a good matrix product approximation to the ground state, it does not imply that we can efficiently find the correct matrix product state. To solve this problem, we construct a sequence of matrix product approximations to the ground states along the entire path in parameter space, as we now explain (the explanation of how to do this given in [9] was not correct, and we now give a full description of the correct construction). Given such a matrix product state, we can efficiently calculate expectation values of product operators such as O .

The Algorithm— At $s = 0$, the ground state is assumed to be a known product state, and hence is a matrix product state of bond dimension $k = 1$. We break the adiabatic evolution for $s = 0$ to $s = s_{max}$ into a sequence of polynomially many discrete steps, such that s increases by a small amount in each step. Specifically, let a_{max} be the smallest integer larger than $4NJ s_{max}/\Delta E$, and let $\delta = s_{max}/a_{max}$ so $\delta \leq \Delta E/4NJ$. We break the adiabatic evolution into a_{max} different discrete steps of size δ , and we set $s_a = a\delta$, for $a = 0, 1, 2, \dots, a_{max}$. We have $a_{max} = \mathcal{O}(N(J/\Delta E)s_{max})$. We fix a maximum bond dimension k_{max} , by setting $k_{max} = k$ for k given by Eq. (4) with $\epsilon = 1/\text{poly}(N)$; the correct choice of ϵ to obtain a given error is given after Eq. (21). Let ψ_a^0 denote the ground state of $H(s_a)$. For $a = 0$, we represent the ground state ψ_a^0 exactly as a matrix product state ψ_a^{mps} . Our algorithm proceeds iteratively, taking a series of a_{max} steps, such that on the a -th step it computes a matrix product state ψ_a^{mps} of bond dimension at most k_{max} which is a good approximation to ψ_a^0 . We do this using the following algorithm:

1: Initialize ψ_0^{mps} to the known initial product state.

2: For $a = 1$ to a_{max} do

2a: Compute a matrix product state ψ_a^t from the state ψ_{a-1}^{mps} as described in the section *Improving the Approximation*. ψ_a^t will be a good approximation to ψ_a^0 , but its bond dimension k' may be larger than k_{max} by a factor polynomial in N and ϵ .

2b: Compute the state ψ_a^{mps} from the state ψ_a^t by a truncation procedure described in *Truncation Error Bounds*. The state ψ_a^{mps} will be

a matrix product state of bond dimension at most k_{max} .

We define the error after each step, ϵ_a , by

$$|\langle \psi_a^{mps}, \psi_a^0 \rangle|^2 = 1 - \epsilon_a. \quad (5)$$

The correctness of the algorithm is based on the inductive assumption that after $a - 1$ steps, we have

$$\epsilon_{a-1} \leq \min(\Delta E/12NJ, 1/99), \quad (6)$$

so that ψ_{a-1}^{mps} is a good approximation to ψ_{a-1}^0 . As we show in Eq. (11), since the difference $|s_a - s_{a-1}|$ is less than or equal to $\Delta E/4NJ$, the state ψ_{a-1}^{mps} is also a good approximation to ψ_a^0 . We then use the result (11) and the spectral gap and locality of the Hamiltonian to construct a state ψ_a^t which is a better approximation to ψ_a^0 at the cost of increasing the bond dimension above k_{max} as described two sections later. We then truncate ψ_a^t to a state ψ_a^{mps} with bond dimension k_{max} , and we use the area law to bound errors in this truncation.

Both the computational effort required to compute ψ_a^t and the bond dimension k' will be proportional to $(N/\epsilon_a)^{\mathcal{O}(\omega)}$. Since it is possible, given a matrix product state of bond dimension k , to compute expectation values of observables which are products of single site operators in a time polynomial in k , this shows the main result.

Difference Between ψ_{a-1}^{mps} and ψ_a^0 — Assume by induction that after $a - 1$ steps we have a good approximation ψ_{a-1}^{mps} to ψ_{a-1}^0 , namely that Eq. (6) holds. Since $|s_a - s_{a-1}| \leq \Delta E/4NJ$, we have

$$\|H(s_a) - H(s_{a-1})\| \leq \Delta E/4. \quad (7)$$

From Eq. (7),

$$\left| \langle \psi_{a-1}^0, H(s_a) \psi_{a-1}^0 \rangle - \langle \psi_{a-1}^0, H(s_{a-1}) \psi_{a-1}^0 \rangle \right| \leq \Delta E/4. \quad (8)$$

Let E_a^0 denote the ground state energy of $H(s_a)$. We have $|E_a^0 - E_{a-1}^0| \leq \Delta E/4$. Therefore,

$$\langle \psi_{a-1}^0, H(s_a) \psi_{a-1}^0 \rangle - E_a^0 \leq \Delta E/2. \quad (9)$$

Since $H(s_a)$ has a spectral gap ΔE ,

$$|\langle \psi_a^0, \psi_{a-1}^0 \rangle|^2 \geq 1/2. \quad (10)$$

From Eq. (5), the angle θ_1 between vectors ψ_{a-1}^{mps} and ψ_{a-1}^0 obeys $\cos(\theta_1)^2 \geq 1 - \epsilon_{a-1}$. From Eq. (10), the angle θ_2 between vectors ψ_{a-1}^0 and ψ_a^0 obeys $\cos(\theta_2)^2 \geq 1/2$. Therefore, we can bound the angle θ between vectors ψ_{a-1}^{mps} and ψ_a^0 by $\theta \leq \theta_1 + \theta_2$ with $\cos(\theta_1 + \theta_2)^2 = [\cos(\theta_1)\cos(\theta_2) - \sin(\theta_1)\sin(\theta_2)]^2 \geq \cos(\theta_1)^2 \cos(\theta_2)^2 - 2\cos(\theta_1)\sin(\theta_1)\cos(\theta_2)\sin(\theta_2) \geq (1 - \epsilon_{a-1})(1/2) - \sqrt{\epsilon_{a-1}} \geq 1/4$, where the last inequality follows because $\epsilon_a \leq 1/99$ by (6). Therefore, since $|\langle \psi_{a-1}^{mps}, \psi_a^0 \rangle|^2 = \cos(\theta)^2$,

$$|\langle \psi_{a-1}^{mps}, \psi_a^0 \rangle|^2 \geq 1/4. \quad (11)$$

Improving the Approximation— We now explain step **2a**, which uses a state ψ_{a-1}^{mps} which satisfies (11) to construct, for any desired ϵ , a state ψ_a^t such that $|\langle \psi_a^t, \psi_a^0 \rangle|^2 \geq 1 - \epsilon$, with a bond dimensional and computational cost of order $(N/\epsilon)^{\mathcal{O}(\omega)}$. In practice, we would prefer simpler constructions of the state ψ_a^t , as explained in the discussion.

Let the states ψ_a^k be a complete basis of eigenstates of $H(s_a)$ with energies E_a^k . From Eqs. (7,6) and the fact that $\|H(s_a)\| \leq NJ$, after $a - 1$ steps it is possible for the algorithm to compute E_a^0 to an accuracy of $\Delta E/4 + (\Delta E/12NJ)(NJ) = \Delta E/3$ [10]. In the following, assume that the algorithm estimates E_a^0 to be zero (if this is not the case, shift the energies E_a^k by the estimate of E_a^0).

Consider the state

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_a &= \frac{\Delta E}{\sqrt{2\pi q}} \int dt \exp[-(\Delta E t)^2/2q] \exp[iH(s_a)t] \psi_{a-1}^{mps} \\ &= \sum_k |\psi_a^k\rangle \exp[-q(E_a^k/\Delta E)^2/2] \langle \psi_a^k | \psi_{a-1}^{mps} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where q is a number we choose below to be of order $\log(1/\epsilon)$, where ϵ is the error estimate below in (13). We will first show that the difference between $\phi_a/|\phi_a|$ and ψ_a^0 is exponentially small in q and then we will show how to approximate ϕ_a by a matrix product state, giving the desired matrix product approximation to ψ_a^0 . Let $\psi_{a-1}^{mps} = A_a \psi_a^0 + B_a \psi_a^\perp$ where $\langle \psi_a^0, \psi_a^\perp \rangle = 0$. Note that by Eq. (11), we have $|A_a|^2 \geq 1/4$. Let $\phi_a = A'_a \psi_a^0 + B'_a \psi_a^\perp$ with $\langle \psi_a^0, \psi_a^\perp \rangle = 0$. The idea of the integration over time is to approximately project onto the ground state; the projection of ϕ_a on any state ψ_a^k is reduced by a factor of $\exp[-q(E_a^k/\Delta E)^2/2]$ compared to the projection of ψ_{a-1}^{mps} onto ψ_a^k . Therefore, since $|E_a^0| \leq \Delta E/3$, we have $A'_a \geq (1/4) \exp(-q/18)$. However, since all other states have an energy at least ΔE above the ground state, and hence an energy at least $2\Delta E/3$ above zero, we have $B'_a \leq \exp(-2q/9)$. Thus, we can guarantee that the normalized state $\phi_a/|\phi_a|$ is within error ϵ' of ψ_a^0 for any ϵ' by choosing q logarithmically large in N and ϵ' .

We now show how to approximate ϕ_a by a matrix product state. First, replace the integral over all t between $-\infty$ and $+\infty$ by a finite integral, from $t = -t_{max}$ to $t = +t_{max}$ with $t_{max} = 99q/\Delta E$. The error in making this replacement is of order $\exp[-(\Delta E t_{max})^2/2q] = \exp(-99^2 q/2)$. Also, replace the continuous integral over t by a discrete sum over different times t_i . The bound on the operator norm of $H(s_a)$, $\|H(s_a)\| \leq NJ$, implies that $|\partial_t \exp[iH(s_a)t] \psi_{a-1}^{mps}| \leq NJ$, and so we can approximate the integral by a sum with an error ϵ' using $n_{sum} = \mathcal{O}((t_{max} \Delta E/\sqrt{2\pi q})(NJ t_{max}/\epsilon')) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{q} NJ t_{max}/\epsilon')$ terms in the sum.

We now approximate the sum of these n_{sum} states by a matrix product state with polynomial bond dimension. It was shown[11] using Lieb-Robinson bounds[12, 13] that the state $\exp[iH(s_a)t_i] \psi_{a-1}^{mps}$ can be approximated

to error ϵ' by a matrix product state with a bond dimension $\exp(\mathcal{O}(t_i J \ln D)) k_{max}$ times a function of N/ϵ' which grows slower than any power. Since t_i is of order $(1/\Delta E) \ln(N/\epsilon')$, the state $\exp[iH(s_a)t_i] \psi_{a-1}^{mps}$ can be approximated by a state with bond dimension of order $(N/\epsilon')^{\mathcal{O}(\omega)} k_{max}$ [14]. The sum over n_{sum} different matrix product states is still a matrix product state, with a bond dimension which is n_{sum} times as large. Let the normalized sum of matrix product states be ψ_a^t . Therefore for any ϵ we can choose q such that

$$|\psi_a^t - \psi_a^0|^2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (13)$$

and such that ψ_a^t is a matrix product state with bond dimension polynomial in N and $1/\epsilon$ and such that computing ψ_a^t requires only polynomial computational effort.

Truncation Error Bounds— We now bound the truncation error introduced in **2b**. By the area law, the ground state ψ_a^0 obeys

$$|\chi_a - \psi_a^0|^2 \leq \epsilon, \quad (14)$$

for some χ_a which is a matrix product state of bond dimension k , and thus from (13,14) we have

$$|\chi_a - \psi_a^t|^2 \leq 4\epsilon. \quad (15)$$

Pick any bond and do a Schmidt decomposition of ψ_a^t across that bond, writing $\psi_a^t = \sum_\alpha A(\alpha) \psi_L(\alpha) \otimes \psi_R(\alpha)$. Order the Schmidt coefficients so that $|A(\alpha)|$ is decreasing as α increases. Then, from Eq. (15),

$$\sum_{\alpha > k} |A(\alpha)|^2 \leq 4\epsilon. \quad (16)$$

We now define ψ_a^{mps} . As shown in [15], the bound on Schmidt coefficients in Eq. (16) implies that there exists a matrix product state ψ_a^{mps} with bond dimension k such that

$$|\psi_a^{mps} - \psi_a^t|^2 \leq 8(N-1)\epsilon. \quad (17)$$

The construction in [15] is defined in terms of the matrices which are the parameters of the matrix product state; an equivalent construction is to define, for each $i = 2, \dots, N$, the operator $P_{i,N}$ to project onto the k largest Schmidt coefficients of the reduced density matrix ψ_a^t on sites $i, \dots, N$. Then, let ψ_a^{mps} be defined by

$$\psi_a^{mps} = Z^{-1} P_{N-1,N} P_{N-2,N} \dots P_{2,N} \psi_a^t, \quad (18)$$

By Eqs. (14,17),

$$|\psi_a^{mps} - \psi_a^0|^2 \leq \epsilon + 8(N-1)\epsilon + 2\sqrt{8(N-1)\epsilon}. \quad (19)$$

Therefore,

$$|\langle \psi_a^{mps}, \psi_a^0 \rangle|^2 \geq 1 - \epsilon_a, \quad (20)$$

with

$$\epsilon_{a+1} = \epsilon + 8(N-1)\epsilon + 2\sqrt{8(N-1)}\epsilon. \quad (21)$$

By picking ϵ small enough, we can ensure that (6) is true after a steps, given that it was true after $a-1$ steps, and we can make $\epsilon_{a_{max}}$ polynomially small at a polynomial computational cost. This completes the error estimates.

Discussion— This work raises several natural questions in the field of Hamiltonian complexity. First, what happens in more than one dimension? We do not know of a general proof of an area law in more than one dimension, and it is quite conceivable that adiabatic simulation in two dimensions with a constant gap and a unique ground state is computationally universal.

Second, the algorithm we have chosen is not very practical. While the construction of the state ψ_a^t requires only polynomial time, and hence this work suffices to show in principle that adiabatic simulation with a constant gap is not useful in one dimension, in practice we prefer to construct matrix product states with as low a bond dimension as possible. This is why low order Trotter-Suzuki approaches are popular, such as the TEBD algorithm[16, 17]. Therefore, it is of great interest to prove that the following natural algorithm always suffices to approximate the ground state: make the spacing $s_a - s_{a-1}$ very small (polynomially small in N) so that the state ψ_{a-1}^{mps} is polynomially close to approximating the ground state ψ_a^0 . Then, in step **2a**, set $\psi_a^t = (1 - H(s_a)/\|H(s_a)\|)\psi_{a-1}^{mps}$, or perhaps instead $\psi_a^t = \exp(-H_{even}(s_a)\tau)\exp(-H_{odd}(s_a)\tau)\psi_{a-1}^{mps}$ where τ is some small quantity and $H_{even,odd}(s_a)$ represent the terms of $H(s_a)$ on the even and odd bonds respectively. Finally, do the truncation step **2b** as before. Such a proof would require a much more accurate analysis of the error in the truncation step.

Finally, it is important to understand the role that the adiabatic evolution plays in our result. The area law implies the existence of a good matrix product state approximation to the ground state. This implies that the following decision problem is in NP: given a Hamiltonian H with interaction strength J and local Hilbert space dimension both $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and with nearest neighbor interactions, and given the promises that H has a unique ground state with inverse spectral gap which is $\mathcal{O}(1)$, and that the ground state energy E_0 is either ≤ 0 or $\geq 1/\text{poly}(N)$, decide whether the ground state energy is indeed less than zero. Such a problem is in NP because the matrix product state guaranteed by the area law acts as a witness, in computer science language, or as a variational state, in physics language. However, we have no guarantee that we can efficiently find such a state. Indeed, it has been shown that there are problems with a ground state which has a polynomial bond dimension as a matrix product state for which computing this matrix

product state is NP-hard[18]. This result [18] holds for systems with an inverse polynomial spectral gap, rather than those with a constant gap as we consider here, so it is not certain what the difficulty is of finding matrix product states for the systems we consider, but it may indeed be a difficult problem. Thus, the ability to *follow* the state along the adiabatic change in the Hamiltonian is useful precisely because it allows one to be sure of locating a good matrix product approximation to the ground state.

Acknowledgments— I thank D. Aharonov and G. Freedman for many useful discussions, and R. Hanson for comments on a draft. This work was supported by U. S. DOE Contract No. DE-AC52-06NA25396.

-
- [1] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
 - [2] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
 - [3] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, and M. Sipser, arXiv: quant-ph/0001106.
 - [4] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, J. Lapan, A. Lundgren, and D. Preda, Science **292**, 472 (2001).
 - [5] D. Aharonov, W. van Dam, J. Kempe, Z. Landau, S. Lloyd, and O. Regev, *Proc. 45th FOCS*, 32, IEEE, 2004.
 - [6] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or, *Proc. 29th STOC*, 176, ACM, 1998; A. Kitaev, Russ. Math. Surv. **52**, 1191 (1997); E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. Zurek, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **454**, 365 (1998).
 - [7] S. P. Jordan, E. Farhi, and P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052322 (2006).
 - [8] M. Freedman, M. Larsen, and Z. Wang, Commun. Math. Phys. **227**, 605 (2002); M. Freedman, A. Kitaev, and Z. Wang, Commun. Math. Phys. **227**, 587 (2002).
 - [9] M. B. Hastings, J. Stat. Mech, P08024 (2007).
 - [10] We ignore error due to the finite numerical precision of real number arithmetic on a computer. Such error can be taken into account straightforwardly if desired.
 - [11] T. J. Osborne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 157202 (2006).
 - [12] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, Commun. Math. Phys. **28**, 251 (1972).
 - [13] M. B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. B **69** 104431 (2004).
 - [14] The same exponent, ω , up to to constant factors, appears in [9] and here, because both constructions start with state with non-zero overlap with the ground state and bootstrap this to construct a state with a better overlap.
 - [15] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 094423 (2006).
 - [16] M. Zwolek and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 207205 (2004).
 - [17] F. Verstraete, J. J. Garcia-Ripoll, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 207204 (2004).
 - [18] N. Schuch, J. I. Cirac, and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 250501 (2008).